

Richard Nixon Presidential Library  
Contested Materials Collection  
Folder List

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>No Date</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
48	7	10/9/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to the President RE: Potential political problems "which could casue rapid dissipation of the present lead." 3 pgs
48	7	8/31/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Khachigian to Colson RE: Shriver's Confederate ancestors. 1 pg.
48	7	8/14/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to Haldeman and Colson RE: Monday Morning 9:15 am Meeting. 3 pgs.
48	7	8/6/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to the President (per HRH as requested) RE: Poll Briefing. 2 pgs.

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>No Date</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
48	7	8/7/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to Colson (per Dick Howard) RE: "The following are lines we can and should use in my view in the immediate wake of the Veep choice." 3 pgs.
48	7	7/26/1972	<input type="checkbox"/>	Campaign	Memo	From Buchanan to Haldeman RE: the letters operation, 1701, used to move the "negative" on McGovern. 1 pg.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 9, 1972

POLITICAL MEMORANDUM

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

FROM: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

With four weeks to go the political situation seems to have stabilized. With McGovern not moving as dramatically as necessary; indeed hardly moving at all, according to Harris.

The following are what I see as potential problem areas for us politically, which could cause a rapid dissipation of the present lead.

1) Sam Ervin & the Watergate. Should a Congressional hearing be called the focus of the campaign could be turned off of the "negatives" of McGovern onto our "negatives." Given the present disposition of the national media -- the major domos are disappointed in the lack of a contest and enraged and frustrated by RN's above-the-battle tactics -- the hearings would be the most celebrated since Army-McCarthy.

2) The McGovern anti-Nixon Commercials. McGovern's people seem finally to have come to the conclusion that their best hope lies not so much in resurrecting their candidate's image -- they don't have the time -- but in tearing down our man. My guess is that they will be extremely rough, and if they are not overdone, fairly effective.

My personal view is that we ought to, now, go on a crash program for some more anti-McGovern commercials to keep in stock.

Beyond that, the latest poll is certain to put pressure on McGovern; and given the fact that his three most sensitive points seem to be Vietnam, (he is proud of his "consistency) Eagleton and "credibility," maybe we ought to begin moving, with some of our surrogates, in a more direct way.

If we can get him talking and arguing about these -- we do well. Frankly, I would like to see the entire Eagleton business, which is such a loser for McGovern, re-elevated by some of our people.

Back to the commercials momentarily -- HHH's anti-Nixon commercials were brutal in my judgment, but effective -- and we should expect that McGovern's will go after the "scandal", "corrupt" issues -- and if they are smart they will not use their principal, McGovern, as they have mistakenly in the past, to act as the Prosecutor.

3) A sharp McGovern movement upward in the polls could conceivably cause a reverse leverage on the "analyses" and "polls" and "local statements" which are right now so damaging to him. Every time a newspaper or survey goes out they come in with startling negative returns for McGovern. And every time a local pol speaks off the record it seems, he raps George. This has to hurt in community after community -- if McGovern starts up, however, this will reverse and one will find poll after poll saying "McGovern closing the gap." While the possibility recedes with each week, the possibility remains of the "comeback" theme catching with the press and public.

4) The apathetic electorate and the low turnout. Though the liberal press has egg on its face now, for its earlier discussion of aroused and alienated electorate looking for McGovern's kind of politics, there seems to be some truth in the possibility of a low turnout, over-confident Republicans, and a McGovern-hard-core maximizing his vote, while we minimize ours. We ought to be giving this problem serious consideration -- although I do not believe it at all calls for RN to hit the stump at this point in time.

5) The media hostility. One has to have seen Agronsky & Co. to visualize it. Since the Broder column there has been piece after piece, taking up the theme that RN has "outwitted" the press, that he is using the enormous resources of the White House to such effect that it is no contest; that McGovern is at an unfair disadvantage; that the President is ignoring the issues, playing above-the-battle, refusing to "engage" in campaign debate, even by long distance, and -- to top it all -- appears headed for a landslide which the press can do nothing about. If one took a poll of the press corps, I would guess that ninety-five to one hundred percent want to see the gap closed.

Recognizing that they are negatively disposed to our campaign at this point, and anxious to leap on any embarrassment -- perhaps we should give consideration to an offensive media strategy to feed the animals, so they aren't chewing on us the rest of the campaign.

Dont' know what we have of substance coming down the pike -- but the more of that the better. One notes that RN's Texas visit which had some substance to it was played extremely well -- and the NY to LA jaunt was played equally badly. We should be thinking of something to give these fellows to write and talk about -- rather than bemoaning our "lack" of a campaign.

THOUGHTS & SUGGESTIONS:

A) We ought to have adopted in advance a strategy for the McGovern ads, whether to ignore them -- or attack them as "smear" -- hopefully they will be so bad that they will indict themselves. But it would be serious for us, I think, if McGovern's ads succeeded in moving the focus off of McGovern's screw-ups and incompetence and his radicalism -- which should be the last four weeks of this campaign.

B) We should be planning now -- not locking in, however -- some election eve, Saturday, Sunday, Monday type drills, which are certain to create massive national interest and participation in the election -- by our folks. We do need to have our troops excited more out there -- they do need to get stirred up -- and given the Presidential podium, one can get the national attention with relative ease.

C) In two weeks or perhaps three, the time may be ripe to be calling -- not for a mandate for RN -- but for a repudiation of McGovern by Democrats. On these grounds, we should move out the line that the McGovernites have given up; they are interested only in a large vote to control the party machinery -- and a Connally and Meany and Fitzsimmons and other Democrats can all call for a national "repudiation of extremism" -- so that the Great Democratic Party can be restored to its rightful owners, the American people. Cast a Vote Against Extremism kind of theme -- something that will convince Democrats that if McGovern even comes close their party is gone from them forever.

D) If we can contain McGovern for twenty more days even, or two more weeks, assuredly there is a fail-safe point at which local Democrats have to jump off and start pushing out their split-ticket sample ballots; with sort of an every-man-for-himself philosophy taking over. That almost but did not happen with Humphrey -- as the unions never deserted him. But if McGovern is hanging where he was last -- two or three weeks from now it could start with him.

E) The President should stay out of the attack business altogether, as of now. This still looks good. Also, the President of all the People, standing up for America, is something disgruntled and even anti-Nixon Democrats can vote for -- if the rest of us can keep McGovern painted as an incompetent and opportunistic radical -- who would do or say anything to win. With McGovern's recent horrible charges he has diminished the possibility of his becoming a sympathetic figure, a martyr, which leaves us some room for toughening the attacks on him.

Buchanan

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 31, 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: CHUCK COLSON

FROM: KEN KHACHIGIAN

Have worked up a brief line on Shriver's Confederate ancestors, and also included a note from Post story indicating that Shriver's family were slaveholders.

Gave it to Stan Scott and he is trying to get the story fed into certain segments of Black media and will give it to Black surrogates.

cc: Buchanan  
Stan Scott

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 14, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO: H. R. HALDEMAN  
CHARLES COLSON

FROM: PAT BUCHANAN

SUBJECT: Monday Morning 9:15 a.m. Meeting

Have to be at the doctor's for a 9:00 a.m. appointment at Naval Medical, but the following are followup attack recommendations for today:

1. Ramsey Clark, along with the Shriver charge, this is issue number one today. Clark will have a press conference. We can piggy-back on this for tonight's TV. Suggest Mitchell Written Statement by PJB -- iterating our demand that McGovern either endorse or repudiate Clark's performance and his "perfect" choice for the FBI. Ignore McGovern charge of "treasonous allegations," and focus on McGovern once again evading re-endorsing a man whom he seems ready to dump over the side. Also, Fletcher Thompson in attacking Clark, and others should keep before the public that he is McGovern's "perfect choice" for the FBI job. Suggest that MacGregor go on TV -- this is "the" story of day, for tonight, demanding anew, along the lines of Mitchell statement that McGovern stop evading and obfuscation and answer to American people if this individual who last week was broadcasting Hanoi's propaganda is still in line to head up the FBI. Also, Mitchell statement of page and a half should contain defense of U.S. pilots slandered by McGovern yesterday. (PJB can have this by noon, by one at latest.)

2. On the Shriver story, that RN "blew it" we should get Lodge on TV; we should turn the focus of this on Shriver and McGovern's credibility; and re-issue that resignation letter from Shriver; as long as the issue turns on whether Shriver was telling the truth or not telling the truth, they can't be making ground. Further, this boiling controversy keeps the Watergate Caper off of page 1. Everything should be done, in statements and the like to portray Shriver as a) not telling the truth and b) keeping silent for three years, seeking a GOP job, and then speaking out only when it was politically profitable. Shriver was a "Silent Partner" in the escalation in Vietnam; endorsed RN's policy, and now for

*Pat do this*

crass political gain is stabbing in the back a President whose policies he endorsed wholeheartedly while in the President's employ.

3. The White Paper of McGovern's on the environment got hardly any serious coverage. We can and should elevate this -- with an EPA, and/or CEQ press conference today -- which attacks McGovern for "gross ignorance of the President's record, for "sloppy staff work" for utter lack of knowledge of the toughest environmental record ever compiled by any President. Impossible to believe Senator McGovern could have seen or signed this idiotic paper -- then a briefing listing of RN's environmental achievements. But the attack on McGovern's "incredible document" should be the lead. Once again reflecting the sloppy staff work that has plagued the McGovern campaign. Tone incredulous that McGovern could have issued such a paper.

4. Don't respond to the false allegation that we accused Clark of treason -- this is what they would like to make the issue -- our issue is that this tool of Radio Hanoi is McGovern's perfect choice for FBI Director, and this is a travesty; and that McGovern should repudiate Clark (even as Senator Proxmire did) and tell the American people in no uncertain terms that he withdraws his endorsement of Clark for FBI Chief.

5. We might need some polling in Pa. to see the damage done on this flood controversy.

6. Page 30 of Saturday News Summary -- Jesse Jackson has some negative remarks on McGovern -- we should get these out to the black press, and have Floyd McKissick use them in attack on McGovern and defense of his decision to go with RN.

7. We should have Paul Keyes working up some humorous lines of ridicule to use against McGovern; if we can get the country making him and his campaign as ridiculous, he may never be able to regain credibility and recover.

8. Within the attack book there are three or four McGovern predictions about what the NVN would do if we halted bombing, etc. All provided wrong. We should have a foreign policy spokesman who can speak to these points, and indict McGovern for having been wrong about every other opportunity, wrong about Hanoi's intentions throughout his career, and a record of misjudging the enemy, reflected anew in his endorsement of Shriver's charge.

9. Note page 18 of N. Y. Times, where McGovern is working on Hill to remove equal time requirement, in which event networks will grant free time. Can we block this?

10. Important thing -- ride the big stories of the day -- Clark, and Shriver credibility.

Buchanan

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 6, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT (Per HRH As Requested)

FROM: PATRICK J. BUCHANAN

Have received the poll briefing and while the findings on the issue are unexceptional, the conclusions that are drawn are wrong, I think -- if I do not mistake them. Our surrogates and the Vice President should not spend a disproportionate amount of their time defending our record on unemployment, and economic management. By most everyone's judgment, our record is not considered as that good; this is our "weakest" point -- and a national debate over whether we managed the economy well is perhaps the one debate with McGovern we can lose.

Agreed that Vietnam, inflation, etc. are the crucial issues. We can win on these issues by not so much verbally defending our record, but by portraying McGovern as disastrous to the stock market, disastrous to the job market with his budget cuts in defense and space, disastrous to the security of the U.S., disastrous to the price situation, because of his \$1000 program, or his \$6500 welfare giveaway. In short, let's not so much defend our record, which is subject to criticism, as to attack McGovern with being a clear and present danger to the prosperity we now have.

The point is this: If the Democrats had nominated Harpo Marx, the Teeter polls would have said Vietnam, economy, inflation are the major issues. Would we, in a race with Harpo, talk about those issues -- or would the winning issues rather be the manifest lack of qualification of their candidate -- despite our record.

The decision in November and our rhetoric must not focus upon their issues -- i. e., "unemployment" and the unequal economic record of the last four years -- it must focus upon our issues -- i. e., the extremism, elitism, radicalism, kookism, of McGovern's person, campaign, and programs, against the solid, strong, effective leadership of the President. The first campaign described above is the only way we can lose in 1972 -- and if I am not mistaken,

this is something close to what the Teeter folks recommend, when they say we ought to talk up the economy, and spend an inordinate amount of time defending our record on unemployment.

Nor should we forget the capacity of a candidate (i. e., Kennedy and the "missile gap," Goldwater and "extremism") to create issues, on which elections turn, sometimes legitimate issues, sometimes illegitimate. When we portray McGovern's ideas as preposterous, foolish, and even dangerous to U.S. security and the nation's economy, we are right now pushing against an open door -- with the media at large, as well as the country.

The campaign should turn, we should make it turn, upon the manifest unqualification of this character and his ilk to even be in the Presidential contest -- not whether a damn referendum in our spotty economic performance, which talking, talking, talking about the economy and jobs, and unemployment would make it. So, I disagree strongly with what I view as the central thrust of recommendations of the Teeter polls.

Buchanan

August 5, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO CHARLES COLSON  
(Per Dick Howard)

FROM: Pat Buchanan

The following are lines we can and should use in my view in  
the immediate wake of the Veep choice:

If it's SHRIVER

- a) No legislative Experience whatsoever;
- b) Never held elective office in his life;
- c) Tenure at OEO left the Poverty Program in an utter shambles;
- d) His only claim to the Vice Presidency is the fact that he  
happened to marry Ted Kennedy's Big Sister.
- e) Selection indicates the desperate straits into which McGovern  
candidacy has fallen -- trying to cover up his shambles of a  
campaign with a little Kennedy glamour once removed;
- f) Running the United States in the final third of the twentieth  
century is one hell of a lot different proposition than being  
Asst. General Manager of the Merchandise Mart. If JFK  
hadn't plucked Shriver out of obscurity, and given him a  
political sinecure in Washington, Shriver would still be out  
there in the Merchandise Mart.

- g) Utterly without experience or qualification to take over at a moment's notice highest office in the land -- owes his nomination not to experience, nor demonstrated capacity, but to the fact he happens to be an in-law of a famous family.

If it's O'BRIEN

- a) Never held elective office in his life;
- b) Political mercenary who wore the collar respectively of JFK, then LBJ, the Bobby, then Hubert, now McGovern;
- c) Political hatchet man whose appointment starts the McGovern campaign down the low road -- his forte is attacking personalities and the kind of name-calling that elected politicians could not afford to engage in;
- d) The essence of the old politics; the most notorious wheeler-dealer on the American political scene;
- e) McGovern's now making his payoff for Convention Chairman O'Brien's "throwing" of the California delegate challenge. O'Brien put in the fix -- by deciding the rules in favor of McGovern -- and McGovern is paying O'Brien back for handing him the nomination;
- f) Act of utter political desperation -- after somewhere between half a dozen and a dozen Senators and public officials refused to run with George;

g) The leading bug-out candidate has embraced as his running mate, the man who did the political throat-cutting of the doves for LBJ in the middle sixties: the odd couple.

Buchanan

PB:nmb

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

July 26, 1972

MEMORANDUM TO: H. R. HALDEMAN  
FROM: PAT BUCHANAN

The letters operation which we helped put together two years ago, and which has functioned well, is in danger of becoming bureaucratized over at 1701. This is one instrument both Colson and I have used to move the "negative" on McGovern -- safely -- into the media. We had planned to continue using it in this fashion -- as we should; to have our people writing letters in support of revenue sharing is, in my view, a waste of a resource. That stuff is going to be decided on the Hill. The imperative thing is to make sure that the McGovern extremist material is being constantly put before the public, as the public view on McGovern is beginning to harden.

As an example, we had that bit from Von Hoffman, where Kimmelman was telling Polish jokes in his suite -- and were moving it to all papers via letters to the editor in cities with large Polish populations. This was halted by 1701 as "too negative." The point is that a) it was totally legitimate and b) the letters don't go out on 1701 stationery. In any event, the tendency to fold the letters operation into the overall strategy is not wise, because of the nature of letters, and because this should be a negative function. Negative letters are the most needed now, the most likely to get printed now, and the most important as McGovern's impression is hardening in the public mind.

We can use other sources to praise revenue sharing. But the letters operation should go back to what it was doing. This indicates, in my view, again, a need to get some organization and structure on the anti-campaign.

Buchanan